UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS
BANGALORE CITY.

LIBRARY COPY

THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.
—*The Voice of the Silence*

VOL. XVII NOVEMBER 1946 No. 11

MODERN SCIENCE AND MODERN MORALS

[**Prof. A. M. Low,** author of *Our World of Tomorrow* and other works, and with several inventions credited to his fertile brain, writes here of "scientific morality." Science has rendered a great service indeed in establishing practically the reign of law. That the consequences of evil cannot be escaped is, however, not an original observation of modern science. It has been taught by all the world's great sages. Modern science has its own peculiar fanaticism: what cannot be demonstrated by its own methods and devices is not to be regarded as true. Its morality, being empiric, is limited by sense-data. The worlds of Psyche and of Nous are *terra incognita;* their intimations even are looked at askance. The true Morality is founded upon the principle of Universal Brotherhood which idea is intuitively accepted by all, though not understood intellectually. This Innate Idea is the real foundation of spaceless and timeless Morality. H. P. Blavatsky wrote that "Humanity is a great Brotherhood by virtue of the sameness of the material from which it is formed physically and morally. Unless, however, it becomes a Brotherhood also intellectually, it is no better than a superior genus of animals."—ED.]

I cannot write impersonally of a subject upon which I have the deepest personal convictions or be persuaded to treat a system of morality as the theme of a philosophical discourse. In my opinion it is wrong to discuss the science of life as if it were no more than a casual essay.

I doubt, indeed, if science and morals are individual subjects and I think it is very necessary to define the meaning of these fine-sounding words. Science is not knowledge; it is progress. It is not a collection of docketed "facts" of which there can be no such thing in our transitory existence. Facts are still matters of opinion. They depend upon the number of people who believe them to be true.

Nor is science the prerogative of mathematics or of history. There are those who believe that education, even culture, is determined by an

improved morality by substituting truth for lies is to do a grave disservice to our brothers.

Briefly, morals today are not represented by the presence or absence of clothes. Truth is more important than the tailor. It may be natural and not immoral to spit upon the floor. But if we know that disease results, surely it is immoral to imperil the lives of others ? Science is bringing us true modesty and basic morality. These are no longer dependent upon the inhibitions of prejudice. We know that ignorance is not innocence.

It is immoral to neglect truth. The scientific mind knows right from wrong independently of regimentation. Prejudiced opinion is not morality and it is very clear that if we attempted to live today by the tenets of two centuries ago we should quite rightly be considered unpleasantly and grossly immoral. Is it not science alone that has taught us this to good effect ?

Civilised morality depends upon the care with which we use the knowledge we have gained at the time, and the manner in which we strive to improve it. It is in this respect that science has destroyed a system of shibboleths with a boundary of lies in exchange for morals based upon the best of truth that is in us. Science has exchanged our heritage of evil for the good that conscious knowledge can give.

Morality today means that we try to learn without smugness. It brings reality in place of convenient faith. It means, even in war, that we try to protect the highest forms of life and are willing to sacrifice what we honourably believe to be the animal-like belief of others if our conscience tells us to do so. Conscience made cowards; now heroes can take their place as a result of truth opposed to credulity, ignorance, dogmatism and wilful blindness. Life's values are no longer defined by the calculus of history. We know that deceit is wrong because it encourages the spread of diseased thought; not because we fear punishment at the hands of a semi-pagan God. Life can be of the mind and not material alone. In a word, immorality is stupid.

It has been said that forty per cent of women under the age of forty who are so fortunate as to be having children, are unmarried. Is this immoral ? Does any sane person imagine that because a divorce is made absolute one day before the event the morals of the mother are affected ? Science is not so stupid as to be deceived in this way.

Our morals must stand the test of time for they depend upon our efforts towards progress. Like science they represent the ultimate truth which can do no harm to any creed. Our mental behaviour should far transcend that which is enforceable by law. It is bad laws that last long when they are supported by a fear which forces us to conform to beliefs which in our hearts we know to be untrue. Differences resulting from morals and understanding need not, and should not, find any place in our life.

A. M. Low

PACIFISM, POLITICS AND AMERICA

[**Mr. Hervey Wescott** writes as an American thinker but on a problem common to all countries in which the leaven of the will to peace is working. The clear formulation of the ideal of peace is half the battle, but victory against the forces of destruction calls, indeed, for the translation of the abstract ideal into a workable political formula, as Mr. Wescott brings out here. To this thesis the following article by **Shri J. C. Kumarappa** brings a typically Indian view-point.—ED.]

A majority of the citizens of every "democracy" professedly feel that war is a deplorable return to barbarism. That same majority has now engaged in or supported the bloodiest and most far-reaching of all wars, having discovered that peace cannot be long maintained simply by disapproving of militarism and slaughter. But simple humanitarian opposition to war as a method of settling international disagreements must in fact be a constructive factor in the unsolved problem of peace. Will it take definite and progressive shape in the post-war world ?

Following World War I, large numbers of men and women in Germany, as well as in America and England, enthusiastically adopted pacifist sentiments and promised themselves and their acquaintances that they would never sanction the type of egocentric nationalism which justifies war in defence of "national honour," or to maintain a balance of power. In Germany alone 250,000 people signed a statement completely repudiating their obligation to participate in or support this type of war. But, at almost the same time, both Germany and Japan were being impregnated with the first post-war seeds of a belief in military preparation as the rightful means of redistributing the economic plenty which the prosperous democracies had cornered—and secured by establishment of the League of Nations. Militant leaders pointed out that the democracies refused to arbitrate fairly on economic needs. Subsequently, the German and Japanese Governments began openly to propagandize the philosophy of imperialistic aggrandizement at the expense of any other values—a philosophy which, when couched in softer terms, had once been largely responsible for England's commercial prominence and the territorial acquisitions of the United States. That England and the United States, having achieved economic fortune, should express growing repugnance toward war in no way meant that Germany and Japan, whose conception of success had not yet been attained, would be long dominated by a similar sentiment. While the need for redistribution of natural resources remained after Versailles, the success of the League of Nations depended upon continued acceptance

of a peace based on a power preponderance of the victor coalition.

It became increasingly obvious to competent observers of the international situation during the 1920's that one or both of these growing have-not nations, Germany and Japan, would seek to destroy the prevailing balance of power as soon as circumstances might permit. Treaties were going to be broken and the acquisition of "democratic" territory sought through invasion, and this partially because the League failed to provide for the needs of increased population in Central Europe and Asia. The new war, then, was going to be a war presented to the democracies as a flagrant violation of League terms through open conquest. The American and English public were not going to find themselves dealing with a war answering to the post-mortem description of World War I—*i. e.*, a war of "capitalists" and "munition-makers"—the new war would be introduced to them first as a war of clearly differing political ideologies, and finally as a struggle for "survival." The promises of democratic citizens to renounce the older type of "balance of power" political warfare *seemed* about as relevant as the observations of a botanist during an earthquake. The democracies, apparently, were going to have either to take the initiative in an international economic redistribution and share resources more fully or—eventually—to fight.

Some peace-lovers, looking at the sham and hypocrisy of the "Save-the-world-for-democracy" thesis in the light of what was subsequently disclosed about World War I, and guided by a flood of humanitarian emotions, announced their refusal to participate in any future wars, including wars of direct self-preservation. In 1930, England's pledged pacifists alone numbered between 130,000 and 150,000. They argued that a modern war of self-preservation failed to preserve anything, and felt a strong conviction that mass killing in war was a deep moral wrong which they, as representatives of a pioneering order of thinking, could not support. Approximately one million, throughout the world, signed peace pledges which committed them to unconditional conscientious objection. But this number has been greatly reduced. Men who promised that they would never sanction the participation of their own country in war, put aside their previous anti-war emotions. Why?

It is a demonstrable psychological fact that men who undertake a certain course of action because of emotional stimuli desert it when a different appeal to those same emotions is successfully made. Humanitarianism was the slogan of pacifism. It then became the slogan of British and American "internationalists"—as opposed to the "isolationists." And as Hitler rose to his full height of crushing power, the pacifists seemed less and less able to present a way of meeting the realities of the situation without war. Further, the

majority of those who signed peace pledges following World War I were not only expressing an emotional or moral feeling against war: they were also indicating faith in international law as represented and supposedly administered by the League of Nations. The majority demanded a platform which promised practical and political, as well as non-violent, means of reaching the goal of stable peace. With the failure of practicability of the League experiment, the whole theory of voluntary world federation and organization seemed a futile gesture with which to meet the pressure of German and Japanese ideologies.

Citizens of the democracies were, on the whole, foolishly complacent in believing that the League of Nations and its surrounding aura of armament limitations would proceed smoothly according to glowingly optimistic promises. Today, unfortunately, many pacifists embrace a similar error if they incline simply to hope and pray that, with faith, world government will arrive—when all men in all nations "see alike." Consummation of a desired international end through non-violent means should be sought in political terms, for unless it appears to be "practical," few will follow the lead. Moral appeal alone is not enough for the average man. If the present devotees of non-violence are to become "social pioneers," they must endeavour to develop a method which society can recognize as a possible practical alternative to war in meeting issues of international disagreement.

Deserters of the "peace movement" have often regretfully changed their minds in the face of a new and unprecedented situation, feeling that the way of non-violence neither offers now, nor ever will offer, a workable alternative to protective armament in international politics. The minority known as "pacifists" has yet to meet this challenge fully. Pacifists, for instance, have not unified and organized their efforts. Their possible success would admittedly depend upon education, but no modern nation can be educated upon such a subject simply by the method of humanitarian pamphleteering and speech-making.

Pacifist theory, as the germ of a radical alternative to armament races, can make a contribution if brought into the open, proposed in legislative form by its advocates whenever possible, given rein to utilize its methods in social and international experimentation. If the experiments, once tried, unearth no usable values or methods, we can perhaps temporarily dismiss "pacifism," and benefit by doing so. If positively constructive concepts and methods emerge, we have benefited far more. America, for instance, is probably the world's greatest military power. It is also the nation best situated for making the great experiment of a foreign policy based on the principles of non-violence. It is impossible, however, for a nation consciously to determine which

of these goals is more desirable, unless what is actually achievable is also known. In America, as in other nations, the *possibilities* of non-violence need to be ably explored and clearly presented.

If a combination of non-violence and politics can be made practical, it should be immediately considered in concrete form by all war-rejectors. Unfortunately, religious pacifism is not historically too well adapted for this effort, for it has usually been other-worldly, anarchical. Can the principles of non-violence become a part of national policy in the Western world, and *work?* If so, how? The fate of a future "Peace Movement" may well rest with the answer to these questions. If various forms of "Pacifism" are to have full moral content, they must establish their practical relevance to the political needs of our times. Some pacifists are now keenly aware of their responsibility in this regard, realizing that in a democracy the burden of proof initially rests with the minority, and that in the democracies, conscientious objectors have been recognized as a legitimate minority group. Careful research, study and publication of well-documented articles and proposals is a growing field of action on the Pacifist front.*

More and more the conviction seems to be growing that pacifists should not be pacifists simply by way of emotional preference, but primarily because of a sincere faith in an experimental philosophy. Of course, it is true that many pacifists are still little concerned with taking up the burden of political proof. The majority of this element inclines rather to a belief that is traditionally the property of mystics—that the spiritual force generated by the completely non-violent lives of individuals may lead others to become as the pacifists themselves. This is experimentation, but it is single-edged when it might be double. The end of thought is an act, and for well-intentioned religionists to completely live their philosophies, social acts are necessary.

Present-day pacifism, as characterized by the majority of conscientious objectors and their supporters, is primarily an allegiance to religion rather than to the political principles upon which democracy operates. Primarily "religious" pacifists do not seem inclined to fill the political obligation of reaching the understanding of the majority. The temper of their composite personalities tends more toward philosophical anarchy than toward democracy. Pacifists indulge their fancy unjustifiably if they incline to the belief that there are already sufficient grounds to justify everyone in taking up the banner of conscientious objection. They may pronounce a gulf of moral difference between themselves and the majority, and become uninterested in carrying a burden of

* The work of the Pacifist Research Bureau during the war resulted in accurate and scholarly studies such as *Genesis of Pearl Harbour* and *Comparative Peace Plans*.

political proof. Therefore, purely religious or purely anarchical pacifists as groups become politically static rather than dynamic—a characteristic that, when present in democratic minorities, inevitably leads to their demise.

If it were possible to look upon these two groups, non-pacifist majority and pacifist minority, impartially, the situation might appear as follows: We witness the behaviour of one group, the majority of whom presently choose to consider themselves as religious beings to the near exclusion of political obligations, and the behaviour of another group, whose individuals choose to consider themselves primarily as political beings. If this be true, each stands in need of learning something from the other. Theoretical idealism is worthless. Without deeply-rooted idealism, the "practical" is dangerous.

If pacifists can help to bridge the gap between the two extremes of the "practical" and the "ideal," between means and ends, they will have made the most important social contribution of our era. The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress has made attempts to do so through the use of *satyagraha*. The religious pacifist often fails to see that one of the reasons for the partial success of *satyagraha* in India is precisely the fact that *satyagraha*, as applied by Gandhi and Nehru, has been a political technique involving millions of men *organized politically* to function in accordance with certain policies. Aside from the religious influence which Gandhi has with fully half his followers, he has won also undying allegiance of others by demonstrating a method of political action that has paid practical dividends. The social pacifists who seek to convert their faith into a world movement are just beginning to realize that non-violence is not necessarily dependent upon personal religious beliefs; it can also sometimes be sustained by faith in its political soundness.

The masses of India, it is true, had no opportunity for choosing any other form of resistance against British oppression and exploitation. The Western democracies have now, and always will have, the alternative to non-violence of being able to prepare for and fight wars of either defence or aggression, which will make it exceedingly difficult for the ideals and the psychology of non-violence ever to characterize the policy of such a nation as the United States. If a policy of international non-violence is ever to be achieved, it will be necessary to demonstrate logically to the average man a foreign policy, based on such principles, which would not only eliminate the necessity of participating in what is widely felt to be the moral wrong of warfare, but would also ultimately *pay* in a very real and practical sense, both politically and economically. To be practical is not necessarily to be selfish. Pacifists who talk of a pacifist movement

should recognize that their movement will only "move" appreciably if it becomes integrated with a definite political platform. To the suggestion that pacifists should not become only partially but intensely political, many pacifists will respond negatively. Yet the scene is changing, for pacifism in the modern sense of "non-violence *vs.* whatever forces must be opposed" is first of all contingent upon concerted action—therefore, in essence, political.

The need for such considerations should have been long apparent to pacifists who have endeavoured to make their position seem reasonable to non-pacifists. Such non-pacifists will raise the consistent and well-supported argument that wars are inevitable while nations perpetuate present economies. While pacifists are fond of discussing the type of world solution which should follow a peace treaty concluding war, and have elaborate plans for reconstruction and the spreading of good-will, they have been unable to present their ideas clearly in a form that would allow them to be administered in case the general public approved the recommendations made. "Recommendations" *need* to be made, for they are the forefront of pacifist experimentation. Yet they need to be more specific if they are to win careful appraisal. It is one thing to preach disarmament, or even to secure partial disarmament for a time, when aided by the moral disillusionment following every war, but it is quite another thing to set up a possible means for dealing educatively with every form of aggression on the part of another country or countries.

If the principles of non-violence are to suggest methods of social and political pioneering and become ingredients of a future wide-spread movement, they must be prescribed in terms that have practical as well as moral appeal to the average man. These terms can utilize the influence of trends already in existence. No perfect alternative plan to defensive armament can be evolved at once. Yet many formative elements are on the immediate horizon, despite—or because of—the implications of Atom Bomb warfare. In America, for instance, these elements might be broadly listed as follows:—

1. The general public may pass through the flush of enthusiasm for "holy" war to dissatisfaction with its results and disillusionment with its methods. There are many possible supporters of a new attempt to integrate the economy of the United States with world economy on a war-renunciation basis—even at the expense of a temporarily lowered standard of living incident to the curtailment of many profitable types of foreign trade, in the interests of articles than can best serve *actual needs* abroad.

2. International Socialists and many non-affiliated liberals have long searched for a way to inaugurate a forceful foreign policy backed by concerted economic pressure rather than by resort to arms.

3. One of the ideological traditions of the United States, *via* the "founding fathers," has been the hope of a possible utilization of America as an ideal location for political and social pioneering which could beneficially influence the nations of Europe through the power of example. Washington once wrote that

> it should be the highest ambition of every American to extend his views beyond himself, and to bear in mind that his conduct will not only affect himself, his country, and his immediate posterity, but that its influences may be co-extensive with the world, and stamp political happiness or misery on ages yet unborn.

4. The United States has the resources and the man power to enable it to become a vital part of the economy of every other nation in commodities other than war materials, a vital part also of a higher standard of living for each citizen or subject of those nations—providing that our foreign trade should be carried on strictly as a matter of "non-violent" Government foreign policy and not for private profit. The Government of the United States, with the proper public support, could formulate and keep the terms of a business charter with all nations, or federations of nations, stipulating also severance of such service whenever the foreign policy of another Power overstepped the bounds of definite arbitrated legislation. Foreign trade, disguising private profit interests, has often either controlled or interfered with a mediating foreign policy. In the hands of Government, this relation might be reversed, foreign trade becoming the instrument and servant of a policy designed to serve international economy constructively; *but only if prevention of future wars was thoroughly believed to be more important than the temporary profits of private interests.* And this latter condition might be made attainable by the influence of pacifist principles, clothed in new and coherent forms of political expression.

It is necessary for pacifists to begin thinking in terms of political influence. For instance, national non-violence seems to imply a very clearly marked foreign policy, *i. e.*, the curtailment of the manufacture of any and all munitions and the consequent "refusal" to ship abroad materials that can be used in the production of armaments by nations possessing armaments, or designs and desires for armament building. Such a foreign policy could only come into operation as a result of continued political success for legislation of this type. Such legislation would necessarily be led to utilize and perhaps even to accentuate the present movement toward controlled production, and for this reason, perhaps, the pacifist plan should be first of all national in application, as well as for the purpose of fully representing the basic philosophical principle of pacifism. That principle seems to be: "Adopt the ideal attitude yourself" without waiting for agree-

ment from all others. This idea might conceivably serve as United States Foreign Policy. While conferring with all other nations willing to confer, the United States could yet formulate her own clear-cut economic policy, stripped of all possibilities for private profiteering—and intend to maintain it, *regardless of possible future disagreements* with international partners. Emphasis on this possibility should be the pacifist's contribution to present world planning. Here a basic pacifist principle can be presented to non-pacifists in practical political terms, as well as in the nature of moral argument. The applications which it suggests have all been considered, but never have they become a basis for national agreement.

Tested by the theoretical probabilities of recent past history, such a policy should indicate many neglected opportunities. For instance, if in the interests of just distribution the United States had undertaken the responsibility of seeing a sound German economy stabilized in the infant Weimar Republic at some temporary economic cost to ourselves, we might have been engaged in disputes with England over spheres of influence which would have been settled by arbitration, rather than in a military effort to subdue the forces of Nazism which rose to control in the wake of poverty and starvation.

Those who desire a completely new economy or political order should concern themselves seriously with the possibilities of non-violent direct action *on a scale adaptable to international politics.* The link between may be more accurate sociological history—wider dissemination of vital information concerning the structure of present society—its undesirable features having been imposed *by force.* Further, history is the only laboratory in which plans for the future can be tested. Such a laboratory cannot, of course, guarantee that any plan is perfect. It can, however, assert with a degree of real positivity, for instance, that strict though enlightened Government control of United States trade would have had a fair chance of channeling international politics away from the "inevitables" demanding war.

How do we get "enlightened Government control"? How do we get anything? By desiring, but also by analyzing what it is we desire, and by planning. History will help us here, and history—factual data without sugar-coating or whitewash—became, during the years between World Wars I and II as never before, the property of the average man. To maintain and improve such a history during wartime is nearly impossible. Yet, following the war, "pacifists" can perform a vital function by insisting on its resuscitation.

Sophistication in respect to recent history is a powerful factor in the present desire for world peace, and it is partly causal to the extreme reluctance with which the average American today goes to war. In turn,

this background tends to create a measure of respect for those overt manifestations of the Peace Movement—conscientious objectors. The conscientious objectors today are playing an unusual part, for they focus, experimentally, the deep moral misgivings of the majority. Whatever their limitations as a group, characterized as most groups are by particular forms of dogmatism, they can be an essential factor in the development of World Peace. In the face of apparent threats to continuance of their own life and pursuit of happiness, they yet refuse to resort to defensive means in which they cannot conscientiously believe. They are willing to sacrifice, unwilling to guarantee even their own security at the expense of participation in the psychological and physical destruction of warfare. In the final analysis, perhaps, the success of any lasting plan for world peace cannot be assured by dependence upon a *purely* political solution. It must involve and incorporate the type of moral strength involved in the individual decisions made by the "c. o.'s."

Many means must be found for wakening and utilizing the moral feelings now largely latent in a majority that wages war as the "only" way out. Moral pioneering, as always, must be present in inaugurating beneficial social and political changes. If war is to be renounced, clearly marked alternatives to participation must exist for all. For some, the "individual" alternative of conscientious objection is at present sufficient. Others will demand a solution in political terms. Each of these "Peace Movement" groups may discover some of its own missing elements in the other. If this blending of methods is ever achieved, it will perhaps become clear that the real Peace Movement is not simply the behaviour pattern of a segment of any national population, but an area of expression for feelings, beliefs and reactions common to men of all nations.

HERVEY WESCOTT

PACIFISM, BELLICOSITY AND INDIA

"War is an unmitigated evil to be shunned" will express the sentiment of the common man, woman and child in any nation. Yet periodical wars of global magnitude have become the order of the day. If the love of peace is so widely spread and deeply ingrained in the common man, why have we these holocausts? How can we prevent them? Had not the generations that have gone before us tried to solve these fundamental problems of human existence? If so, can we learn anything from them? Can we contribute anything further?

THE SEED OF WAR. War is the collecti ve mani-

festation of friction between single individuals. Amongst individuals an eruption takes place when one person seeks to enforce his will on another. We desire a certain thing and seek to materialise that desire by an action directed by our will power. If our desire goes contrary to the interest of another, friction ensues; this, in the aggregate, leads to group conflicts or wars. Hence, if we would eradicate this weed from society it would call for the training of our wills in complete alignment with the needs of society. In other words, the solution lies in developing self-control and self-discipline to make us worthy members of society. This was the basis of the Hindu approach to the problem.

If we fail to keep in mind the individual and his conduct but proceed to attack the projection of this malformation into society we shall be guilty of treating the symptoms instead of the disease. At every turn the act of the individual affects society. Even these global wars have their roots in the isolated acts of individuals. Therefore, the individual and the life he leads demand our scrutiny.

IN ANCIENT TIMES. There is a fundamental difference in the social manifestation of wars of the past and those of the twentieth century. Formerly wars were waged by individuals for revenge, for loot, for acquisition of territory or for self-aggrandisement. They were fought by mercenaries or by persons closely allied to the belligerent parties. The general mass of the people kept out of these conflicts. Under such circumstances the evils of war, bad as they always are, were limited.

THE REMEDY. The way to meet the situation was also simple. The Varnashram provided a quarantine for the bellicose. The Kshatriyas were given the monopoly of policing the state internally and of defending the population from external aggression. This was the sociological device.

Culturally, the fighting man was not given the highest status. Anger was considered the base of all crimes. The standard of values was weighted against all whose actions would lead to conflict. Material wealth was sterilised of its glamour. Those who were assigned the highest place in society were those who followed the path of duty to their fellow-men. Among the fertile grounds for conflict were selfishness and acquisition of property. Renunciation was covered with a mantle of sanctity to counteract man's natural greed.

There was a preconcerted plan to block all the sources of violence. Under this order of things our country remained non-violent for centuries, though she had to suffer violence from invaders from time to time.

MODERN WARS. Within living memory wars ceased to be personal conflicts to satisfy individual desires. They have assumed nation-wide proportions. It is no longer Alexander

marching to conquer the world, but the British waging wars against the Germans. This change has been brought about primarily by a change in the economic organisation of society.

With the Industrial Revolution in Europe, centralised methods of production came into vogue. This meant that plant and machinery were situated in one convenient place while the world was scoured for raw materials which were brought over thousands of miles of ocean routes to the central plant. After manufacture, the finished goods had to be taken to the four corners of the earth for sale. This method logically led to the necessity for the owners of the plant and the machinery to keep close control over the raw material resources and to regulate their markets, while policing the ocean routes to keep them open for their merchandise. All this demanded the Army, the Navy and the Air Force to control the lives of other peoples and nations and to guide them into such channels as would ensure the satisfaction of the needs of the machine owners and their world-wide ramifications.

MORAL DEGRADATION. To this end it would not do to impart moral values into the equation. Violence has taken a central place in this economic organisation. It has to command votaries from all sections of society. How can that be done if anger be considered a crime? On the contrary, violence has to be glorified. This cannot be achieved by stigmatising all fighters who make a profession of killing as "murderers," officers as "mass murderers" and Generals as "arch murderers"! No; murdering has to be made an honourable profession. The Army is made into a noble calling, the Navy into an aristocratic allegiance and the Air Force becomes the acme of educational attainment! Impregnating youthful minds with these warped standards of values, in season and out of season, it has been possible to misguide millions, and even women amongst them. Nations have to wage war against nations; hatred and suspicion have to be cultivated to feed the fire of national enmity.

LIVING. Under this octopus, the life of the individual is also set in lines which will absorb the production of the machines. Social values are affixed to modes of life demanding a large consumption of machine products. A man is honoured, not for his character, or for the discharge of his duty to his fellow-men, but for the abundance of things he possesses. This humanly low type of material living has been termed a "high standard of living." Renunciation has no place in this order of things. Self-indulgence, rather than self-discipline, is held up as a goal to pursue. The whole scheme of life is weighted in favour of violence.

PACIFISM. If our analysis is correct, then no amount of sentimental objection to war can be of any avail. Conscientious ob-

jectors in war time only generate more violence. A desire to banish war coupled with a longing for peace must materialise in a mode of life in which violence has no part. To the cry of superficial sentimentalists the war mongers had offered a sop—the League of Nations. They also promised to limit armaments. Can we accept from a seasoned drunkard as an earnest of his teetotalism the gift of an empty bottle or be satisfied with his promise of drinking in limited quantities in future? Yet the world sat back contented, as though Mars had been banished for ever. Was this willingness to be easily satisfied rooted in the fear of facing a form of life in which, violence being eschewed, it will be hard to maintain a "standard of living" without things we had got used to?

No superficial attempts to create public opinion by such slogans as "Save the World for Democracy!" will solve the problem. The innumerable international security conferences have proved to be only endeavours to "keep the other fellow from fighting." Neither can we outlaw war by any international legislation.

We have to face facts sternly and remove the seeds of war from our midst, cost what it may. Unless we go about our business with grim determination, no amount of political reshuffling will come to our rescue. Those of us who are prepared to go to the uttermost should work with might and main during "peace time," or, rather, during the absence of kinetic war. We ought not to be content with surface alterations. The political aspect of war is the least important. We have to reach down to the daily routine of life of every citizen and weed out from it all parasitic growth.

RUSSIA. An experiment to ban private foreign trade has been attempted by the Soviets. But this has not reduced violence. Russia clearly indicates that violence has been generated by causes other than international disputes. A searching analysis will reveal beyond doubt that the terrific internal violence on which Russian life is organised is the result of the regimentation of economic activity called for by the same system of centralised production. So it is not a mere superficial coincidence that Russia finds herself in the company of Imperialist nations vying with each other for the laurel of being crowned "the most violent nation of this generation." Whether it be Soviet Communism, or Nazi State Socialism, or Fascism or the political imperialism of Britain, or the financial imperialism of America, or the industrial imperialism of Japan, they all tend the same way. Therefore, we should look for a common factor in all these organisations. And that seems to be *centralised methods of production* with or without private profit, with their accompanying problems of raw materials and markets.

INDIA. If this then is the root of all violence we have to set about putting every house in the

land in order so that the life in the smallest of social units eschews violence. This brings us to the practical solutions offered by the greatest living pacifist of our times—Mahatma Gandhi. He represents the quintessence of Indian culture and therefore his suggestions may be taken as the efforts put forth by India to meet the situation.

According to our conception of a Pacifist, he must not merely be working against organised warfare. He must not contribute by his action or mode of life to conditions that will precipitate war. Westerners often credit Gandhiji with having evolved a moral equivalent of war in the method of "Satyagraha." This is the least part of his contribution to Pacifism. He has gone deeper, to the root causes of war, contaminating the everyday life of the citizen. These have to be purged out by every single person. Each individual is a potential contributory cause of global wars. To the extent it lies in our power, we have to modify our methods of living to frustrate war.

Foreigners come into a country to sell their goods and to obtain raw materials. If the citizens of the country refuse to have anything to do with this trade—neither buy foreign goods nor sell their raw materials—the basis of foreign violence will be cut out. Foreigners carry on most of their work through the co-operation of citizens—stooges and Quislings. If, by education, we can generate sufficient stamina and moral power for the citizen to withhold co-operation with foreigners no nation can hold another in bondage—violence or no violence. Hence foreign trade in prime necessaries must be banned.

How are we going to adjust our daily life so as to banish war? Every individual has to accept responsibility for all acts that precede the economic transaction into which he enters. No one can say that he washes his hands of moral issues to which he is personally not a party. If we buy a stolen article because it is cheap we have a moral share in the stealing of that article. If we burn kerosene oil knowing that Burmah is held in political bondage for the purpose of exploiting its oil resources, we are also parties to the political slavery of Burmah and to the violence that went before the conquest and that which is needed to keep up the foreign occupation of that country. If we are true pacifists of the Indian type, we cannot use products which have figured in international trade based on or enforced by violence. Giving up the use of foreign products for this reason is not a political "boycott," which latter may be born of violence in thought and deed.

This brings down to earth the academic consideration of international pacifism and pins it to a man's workaday life. Simplifying our lives in this manner and to this end is not a form of asceticism but a resultant of our own limitations. It calls for self-control and self-discipline of a high order. We cannot have self-indulgence and pacifism at

the same time. The necessary ground for this programme has already been prepared by the ancients by the standards of values which they set. Based on that culture, Gandhiji's pacifism manifests itself in his constructive programme. We have to realign the lay-out of society if we desire to outlaw war. Limiting our consumption goods to those which have been produced under our ken and for which we are prepared to assume moral responsibility is the foundation of Gandhiji's self-sufficiency programme. Every nation should produce its own primary needs—food, clothing and shelter. Foreign trade there may be, only in luxury goods. Nations do not go to war for this. If England is beleaguered and is in danger of starvation she will stick at nothing to get the food she wants.

The present economic organisation rests on the foundation of violence. If we seek peace we have to rebuild our social structure on conditions in which there will be no need for resorting to violence as a means of maintaining our social order. No tinkering with this problem will answer the purpose. Hard as it may seem, we have to face realities. So far, the Pacifists of the West have contented themselves with enlisting public opinion against war, ignoring the fact that peace and great possessions arising out of centralised methods of production are poles apart. The high standards of the West cannot be maintained without holding in bondage the weaker nations of the East. Are the pacifists prepared to make the necessary fundamental adjustments in their own life, in the first instance, and in the life of their nation eventually? This is the crucial test. No makeshift arrangement or patchwork will bring us lasting peace or good-will amongst the nations.

We have to awaken the moral consciousness of youth and call a spade a spade. Let there be no soft-pedalling on mass murders euphemistically called "Wars." Let the youth know when he enlists in the "Forces" he is joining a gang of international murderers and brigands. We cannot call into action the noble patriotism, enthusiasm and energy of youth for so vile a purpose. Let us raise the moral consciousness and lower money considerations and material values. If we succeed in doing these things then alone shall we be practical pacifists working towards a time when youth shall learn war no more. Thus shall we usher in an age of peace in this war-torn world and rescue civilisation from barbarism.

J. C. KUMARAPPA

THE DIDACTIC IN THE ART OF DICKENS

[**Shrimati M. A. Ruckmini**, an Advocate of the Madras High Court, writes here of Dickens as the novelist who, like his contemporary Thackeray, brought about certain partial reforms and pointed the way to others not yet realised. There is great need today of writers to combine with the insight and the humour of Dickens the fearlessness of Dostoevsky in laying bare the inhumanities and the hypocrisies of present-day society. Of writers able, above all, to understand, remember and record " the innermost feelings and the aspirations of the poor people's great and suffering heart. " Of writers capable of speaking, with beauty and with power, " to the awakening Spirit of Humanity. "—ED.]

In the long and chequered history of the development of the English language and literature, the problem whether a work of fiction can enjoy an independent status as a work of art or whether it can be justified only if it embodies some definite didactic element—not necessarily ethical or metaphysical moralising—has been fairly frequently debated. The rival alternatives have enjoyed the championship of equally powerful advocates. Quite apart from the merits and issues of the controversy, we are perhaps more often than not inclined to condemn fiction, except the type given by some few master craftsmen, as a series of shifting scenes which, to the subtle mind of Bergson, suggested a philosophy of the cosmos as a succession of moments which titillate the senses for the nonce, leaving the deeper springs of genuine personality absolutely unaffected.

If any writer can be exempted from such a reproach it is Dickens, who saw life in all the myriad shades and the vastly varied vicissitudes of active and dynamic experience. I would like to suggest that Dickens enormously enriched his art by means of the sternly realistic element which he has cleverly and harmoniously blended with his fiction. His writings teem with the amazingly multifarious types of humanity that have from time to time marched past on the world stage. His writings are not a monotonous narration of incidents of history, nor do they glorify the sentimental romance of frivolous fancy, without any basis of concrete facts. The raw material supplied by the stubborn realities of life has been transformed by the alchemy of his vivid imagination into living characters pulsating with intense life and surcharged with enlivening humour. Almost all the major characters in Dickens are endowed with a robust realism which renders the world of Dickens a faithful reproduction of the human found in Nature.

This naturally pushed into the

focus of critical appreciation the relation between realism and caricature which involves a supremely interesting element of modern psychology. Some would consider Dickens a caricaturist who has painted his characters in gorgeousness or intensity out of all proportion to reality. Whether or not a picture is overdrawn cannot be decided offhand. Comparative judgment is a personal reaction, a response to stimuli, and must in the final analysis depend on the mind concerned. If a person happens to be congenitally blind to the happenings around him or if he should disregard certain events—even the most striking—as trifles, such a perverted mind sees only overdrawn pictures when a master artist like Dickens infuses life into apparent trifles and converts them into tremendous truths touching and telling in their appeal. In the daily routine most of us fail to note many sensations and experiences that assail our minds from all directions; we have neither time nor inclination to study and respond to them properly. It is at this juncture that a poet or a philosopher appears on the scene. He sees each colour, each shade, hears each note, however faint, and, out of all these countless sensations, reconstructs life in its fullest development and natural unfoldment. That is exactly what Dickens has done, and that is the characteristic mark of his art.

Let us briefly investigate. Has a novel served its purpose? Has it satisfied a personal intellectual need? The only true test would be whether one is able to enjoy a novel after hard hours of daily labour as a sort of relaxation, recreation, which would tone up or reinvigorate the mind jaded by the daily routine. Such a tonic renovation can come only on the basis of sympathy and understanding. Utterly strange characters have no interest for us. Most people like reading about people more or less similarly circumstanced, facing pleasures and disappointments, fighting the battles of life, struggling, failing and achieving, much like themselves. In such reading they feel empathy, as the psychologists would term it. When in novels one meets characters similarly stationed, he feels that he is not alone in the world. He enlarges the circle of his acquaintances, makes new friends in fiction, sees life in a different perspective, and realizes that in the long and tiresome pilgrim's progress towards Reality there are countless others to be met with from whose life he can take courage, comfort and consolation.

Dickens has held a mirror up to Nature and to Life. He has delineated exquisitely the genuine longings of the spirit, the inner self which cannot be compelled to live cribbed, cabined, and confined within the four corners of artificial control. Natural human feelings, perfectly legitimate and genuine emotions, desires etc., cannot be subjected to school-room discipline and mechanised control. Dickens records with a fine sense of

the inherently incongruous how—notwithstanding school-room timetables, rigorous enforcement of rules, the tyranny of facts, conventions and artificialities, and an existence drilled by the orders of Thomas Gradgrind—the latter's own son and daughter, ground in the mill of facts, steal a moment's respite from Euclid to seek consolation in the creations of their own fancy.

In his perception and his sympathies Dickens as a novelist is a universalist. His canvas glows. The contemporary scene teemed with multitudinous forms and patterns, but Dickens, in a single sweep as it were, harmonized the different categories of human nature, from the dull schoolmaster to Sarah Gamp. To him no situation was too mean, too insignificant, no emotion undeserving of study, none from which he could not draw a lesson, none which he could not sympathetically understand.

I wish to refer to one or two characters especially which not only are fine examples of Dickens's creative art, but also throw a flood of brilliant light on the contemporary problem of educational reform. The true place and function of the schoolmaster, who has the tremendous responsibility of moulding the future generations, have not yet been correctly understood. The defects, or rather the impossibility, of hothouse cultivation of the child's intellect at the expense of the feelings and all other aspects of the personality none would seem to have emphasized more tellingly than Dickens. Educating the reason without cultivation of the sentiments and the affections is unnatural, impracticable and monstrous, Dickens would have it. Mention may be made of Scissy, brooding over the rise and fall of the sparks which give her thoughts of the ephemerality of life, in spite of the rigid schoolmaster's sonorous lessons on combustion, calcination etc.; of the Coketown population's realizing that the more they worked the stronger grew the craving in them for the expression of high spirits which must be satisfied; of Tom's spitefully setting his teeth and exclaiming: "I wish I could put a thousand barrels of gunpowder under the *facts* and blow them all up together and have my revenge" and his mother's vigorous retort, "I wish I had no family and then you would have known what it was to do without me." These illustrations are enough to demonstrate that Dickens's characters are not mere automata, but creations of flesh and blood with distinctive individualities which cannot be squeezed into strait-jackets of conventions and dogmatic discipline. When the environment grows a dead weight, the spirit of man revolts.

The sordid coarseness and brutality of Jonas Chuzzlewit would have been unnatural if there had been nothing in his early education, his environment and the precepts before him to engender and develop the vices that make him so repugnant. So born, so bred, admired for that

which afterwards made him hateful, justified in his cradle in his treachery, cunning and avarice, he is the legitimate son of the father on whom the vices seem to recoil. The father's reaction to the vices of his son may be not mere poetical justice but a stern vindication of the eternal truth of which it is a brilliant exposition : " As you sow, so you reap."

From this brief mention of some Dickens's characters, it must be obvious that the most outstanding characteristic of his art is the harmonious blending of the realistic elements of life and nature with those of fancy and of fiction. Long before the advent of modern psychology so-called, Dickens was a profound psychologist. Like any other master artist he amply realized that human beings, like the tuning-fork, are capable of sympathetic vibration and response. Even in fiction people like to read of the anticipations and achievements of characters like themselves. Unless there is admixture of the realistic element, fiction *per se* is bound to be devoid of use. Dickens has suspended the didactic on the peg of the realistic in his work, and that it is precisely which has enhanced the beauty and appeal of his art.

But Dickens is not only the artist. He is also a vehement reformer. He asks us to face the truth, unpalatable as it may be, that most so-called disgraces of humanity are due to our own deeds of shame, which have peopled our prisons and overcrowded the colonies. Such monstrosities are due to feelings dulled and atrophied. Given neighbourly sympathy and mutual understanding, an earthly Paradise may be no idle dream but a concrete reality.

As an educational reformer, Dickens wants, side by side with factual instruction, the education of the whole personality without over-emphasis on a particular aspect. The light from the torch which he holds aloft is bound to illumine many a dark corner of the educational cosmos of the present day. Not to create dwarfs, stunted specimens, but stalwarts with a full, rich unfoldment of the entire personality must, according to Dickens, be the aim of education. He would enter an emphatic protest against the modern craze for specialisation in education, which should rather aim at a trilateral development of intellect, emotion and will, constitutive of the whole personality. Therein lies the distinctive appeal of the art of Dickens.

M. A. RUCKMINI

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

MASTER AND DISCIPLE *

Ruskin is at present so much in eclipse that Professor Livingstone begins his lecture with a question. Is this, he asks, "a 'master-mind,' a permanent star in English literature, or a brilliant meteor that flashed across the sky? Has the thinker with such significance for the last generation any message for our own, or is he merely a great writer?" That he was a great writer few could deny, but, strangely enough, it is just this which has proved the barrier to appreciation of him today. He had, as Professor Livingstone points out, two distinct styles, the earlier one coloured and ample, the later one pungent and economical. The elaborate intricacy and ornateness of his earlier manner are not to the taste of our hurried and matter-of-fact age, while his later is suspect for its oratorical qualities.

But deeper than style there is another cause of dyspathy. Ruskin was a moralist and one who brought his moral convictions to bear upon two spheres of human activity, art and economics, in which the moralist is least welcome. There were plenty of people in his own day who were ready to agree with his overstatement that "Art is valuable or otherwise, only as it expresses the personality, activity and living perception of a good and great human soul." But when for the same reasons he later demonstrated that economists were not only mistaken but impractical, because they treated man as an animated machine, forgetting that he was a moral and spiritual being, he was generally denounced. Today, it would seem, he is equally unacceptable to the æsthete, the intellectual and the Marxist.

Yet, as Professor Livingstone shows, despite his tendency to extravagance and incidental fallacies, he was essentially right. For his moral conviction was never an acceptance of approved moral standards. It was rather a belief in "the pre-eminence of soul," of that integrating principle which, whether in a work of art, a person, or a society, should so govern the organism that no separate cell should live for itself alone, but each part should live for and in the whole. Or, more simply, as Professor Livingstone puts it,

> he conceived life as a system of which the sun is God; from whom man derives his light and in turn irradiates with it his own creations. He thought that the aim of civilization was to create good human beings, and, for that end, to make a world in which they can be good.

If such a faith and vision were needed to challenge the merchant outlook of the English middle-class of Ruskin's own day, they are even more relevant perhaps in our own age with its scientific and technical materialism. Ruskin may not have been a "master-mind." He was not a systematic thinker. But

---

* *Ruskin*. By R. W. Livingstone. Annual Lecture on a Master Mind. Henriette Hertz Trust of the British Academy, 1945. (Oxford University Press, London. 2*s*.)

William Morris: Medievalist and Revolutionary. By Margaret R. Grennan. (King's Crown Press, New York, and Oxford University Press, London. $2.50 and 16*s*. 6*d*.)

he was a prophet as well as a great writer, one who foresaw the catastrophe towards which man was tending and who, now that the catastrophe has occurred, should find more and more to heed his passionate reminder that the tree of knowledge or of material increase is not of itself the tree of life.

Professor Livingstone's lecture is an excellent introduction to Miss Grennan's study of William Morris. For Ruskin, as Morris gratefully acknowledged, was his master. Of all the influences which affected him and helped to shape his artistic and social theories and their medieval expression, Ruskin's *Stones of Venice* was the greatest. In later life he said of it that "to some of us when we first read it now many years ago, it seemed to point out a new road on which the world would travel." Before he died, Morris was far less sure that the world would take that new road—on which the creative values of medievalism were reborn in a socialism that was true fellowship. He had begun to feel like Ruskin that a catastrophe must first come, and even almost to welcome the necessity. But how enviable were the hopes and dreams that he could still cherish and propagate through his most vigorous years! All his work was, in his own words, the "embodiment of dreams in one form or another." For his vision was a poet's in every aspect of life that he touched. But he was a very practical poet intent on translating the dream into fair and homely human fact. To achieve that involved an all-out war against his age, against its satanic industrialism, "the greatest disaster," as he called it, "that has ever happened to the race of men," with its greedy mechanistic exploitation of the manual worker. In this war, he had some doughty predecessors, as Miss Grennan shows, from Cobbett to Carlyle, but none who so intimately identified themselves with the social life and the living crafts of the Middle Ages as he.

Morris loved the medieval world so deeply, he saw it with his pictorial eye so vividly, that inevitably he idealised it a little. In seeing the best in it, he tended to overlook the worst. Yet he was far from uncritical and his own varied practice as a craftsman qualified him even better than Ruskin, to assess the innate virtue that flowered in its handiwork and social usage. He may, perhaps, have exaggerated in claiming, for example, that fourteenth-century Gothic was the most completely organic form of art the world has ever seen and in his Norse enthusiasm he may have minimised the brutality which co-existed with the staunch vigour and independence and fellowship which he so much admired. But essentially what he praised and re-imagined to kindle the imagination of a later time had existed and had most lamentably been lost in the sweated factories and commercial imperialism of Victorian England. First and last, his aim was to restore joy in labour and this led him from medievalism to socialism. The burden of Miss Grennan's book is to trace the relation between these two passions of his life.

Unlike Ruskin, Morris believed in equality. He recognised, of course, that men differed in capacity or desires or temperament. But he insisted on equality of condition. Ruskin was a solitary being, alone, as Miss Grennan remarks, in his thought as in his life. Morris loved the fellowship of work and play, though he, too, was in the

depths of his being curiously inaccessible. Yet humanly simple and generous as was his belief in equality, its foundations were uncertain, and it is here, perhaps, that his socialism was most vulnerable. Bernard Shaw called him the "Saint of Socialism," but he was a saint who conceived the kingdom of God as exclusively on earth and who in his absorption in the social virtues and activities overlooked those hidden realms of the spirit from which not only social unity flows but also those evils and perversities which destroy social happiness.

Morris recognised the essential part the Medieval Church played in the social sphere, but disregarded altogether the mystical and metaphysical heart of it. In his own age he saw a Church as degenerate in its faith and practice as the society of which it was a part. Reasonably enough, therefore, it found no place in the new order of life and society which he preached. Yet his religion of socialism, though it was never a mere political creed but a theory of life with an ethic and æsthetic of its own, lacked the transcendental sanctions which his beloved medieval society had possessed through its Church and Monastic orders. For this he offered no substitute. The happy folk of *News from Nowhere* are so perfectly and harmoniously at home on earth that they have no need of heavenly researches or moral disciplines. But, as Miss Grennan notes, "the account of the Great Change is less vividly conceived than the sections treating of the ideal society already realized." Indeed the Change is only pleasantly fancied. The obstacles in human nature are never faced.

Yet, granted this, we have only to measure Morris's socialism by contemporary communism with its materialistic outlook to see what truly human and religious virtue it possessed. Morris became a socialist first and read Marx afterwards and his social thinking was always related to the creative life. He repudiated the corrupt present only that he might restore the broken link between an organic past and an organic future. He recognised both historical determinism and human freedom and in the advent of "economic man" he read the disintegration of the modern world. In his last years he regretfully admitted that State Socialism might be the necessary transition between capitalism and the human brotherhood in which he believed. But he wished to avoid it, if possible, since it was likely to represent the machinery of socialism deprived of its spirit. If he could have lived to see State Communism in action, he would doubtless have repudiated it as vigorously as the industrialised slavery of his own day.

Yet in the ruin of European civilisation he would have seen, too, an opportunity for the emergence of that real decentralised socialism of which he dreamed, in which nations, as we now know them, will cease to exist, and society, "conscious of the wish to keep life simple," will willingly sacrifice some mechanical gains for a greater return in humanity. Morris may have underestimated the inner change from which the outer must come. He may have passed too lightly over means in picturing the end that his heart and hands desired. But the life he saw and so vividly painted in his verse and prose is truly a good life because it is qualitatively good, as true art is which makes work happy and rest fruitful.

In an age that reckons by mere quantity and mass, whether its economics are capitalist or communist, in which the fatal schism between art and daily life still persists, Morris's vision that sprang out of his knowlege of the past, his concern for the present, and his "hope for the days to be" is not out of date. And it has a warm human appeal which Ruskin's lacks. Miss Grennan's study of him is scholarly and justly appreciative, whether she is writing of the prophet, the craftsman, the socialist or the romancer. His sturdy figure comes to life again in her pages as the champion of those poetic and personal values which have determined the really human and the fruitfully practical in every civilisation which has not sold its spiritual birthright for a mess of mammon.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

THE UNITY AND ORDER OF NATURE *

The occasion for the writing of St. Augustine's *City of God* was the dramatic end of an era, the fall and sack of the city of Rome in A. D. 410. The Roman power had been everywhere weakening, and in the year 408 Alaric besieged Rome itself. The Goths poured through the gates of this noblest city in the world in a relentless flood. Death and violation and the terrible savageries of the barbarian Gothic hordes, the looting of temples, palaces, shops, houses, the burning and despoiling went on day after day.

That tragic fall of the city which for seven hundred years had dominated civilization created consternation throughout the known world. Jerome, the famous scholar, hundreds of miles away in his cell in Bethlehem, voiced the feelings of all men when he cried, "My tongue cleaves to the roof of my mouth and sobs choke my utterance to think that the city is captive which led captive the whole world." Though in their hearts men knew that the Roman Empire was breaking, always something had happened to save the city itself—a last-moment victory, or even a shameful buying off of the enemy. But now it had happened, and neither Roman skill of arms nor barbarian leader fighting for her, nor bribery, nor intervention by Emperor or Pope had saved a situation which for long had been degenerating. What was the cause of this decay, what was the malady afflicting the Empire? This burning question provided a rallying point for Paganism. It was Christianity, came the answer. The new religion with its doctrines of love and forgiveness was weakening the courage which had made Rome mistress of the world when the citizens thronged the temple of Mars. A new wave of Paganism was formed under the influence of this fear, the greatest wave since the Emperor Julian had issued his edicts against the Christian faith sixty years before.

The tide of this anti-Christian reaction swept across Africa to the city of Hippo where a certain learned bishop called Augustine faced it, and answered it. His famous answer is known as

* *The City of God*. By SAINT AUGUSTINE. In two volumes. (Everyman's Library, Nos. 982 and 983, J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., London. Each volume 3*s*. 6*d*.)

The City of God. It originated in a reply to a Christian tribune who had appealed to Augustine for ammunition to take up the challenge of a Pagan teacher called Volusianus who had enquired how the doctrine of non-resistance could be harmonised with the successful rule of Empire. Augustine turned his letter into a book, and working on it for fourteen years, produced a volume of twenty-two books.

I noted that *The City of God* was described the other day as " the greatest prose epic that has ever been written. " Strong words. But somewhat typical of the kind of thing that it is thought proper to say about the book. Readers would be well-advised to be on their guard against such praise. The book had a powerful influence, and perhaps was indeed the most influential apologia ever penned. But as literature it cannot fairly be said to be readable. And since its work is done it is sufficient to know its gist. It began with a complete refutation of the old pagan creeds and of all heresies; it became a history explaining the course of events; it contained a moral code for men and states; it included an encyclopædia of theories of antiquity as weighed against the truths of Christianity; it was a storehouse of theological dogmatism and heretical exposure. Throughout, the style is even more turgid and repetitive than that of the Hebrew prophets. But that did not matter, for it was new wine. In place of the Roman civic virtues it demanded love; against the organisation of a great Empire in this world which had been the Roman ideal, it urged abandonment of this world; against the simple division between Romans and Barbarians it put the internationalism of Christianity; against the vast social divisions it set the new value that even the slave could be free. It is claimed by scholars that *The City of God* established its interpretation in the minds of men for more than a thousand years. That is enough fame for any book, and it is unnecessary to pretend that it is also an epic in the sense that the *Gita* is.

Nevertheless the modern reader will find a central core in Augustine's metaphysic that is completely sympathetic to him. Augustine believed in the Unity and Order of Nature, in what he called " the universal peace " holding creation together. Hang a person upside down, he said, and watch what happens. It is a position contrary to the order, the natural law, the peace of that body. This confusion will disturb the flesh and be troublesome to it, and the soul may well leave the body owing to these troubles. Then what results? The body presses towards the earth: "the very weight seems to demand a place of rest." Imagine the body left alone day after day, either hanging in the air or buried in the earth. Order, natural law, peace, all return. The body dissolves into the earth and into the air. " It is assimilated into the elements of the Universe; moment by moment, particle by particle, it passes into their peace; but nothing is in any wise derogated thereby from the laws of that Highest and Ordaining Creator by whom the peace of the world is administered. " Such a passage strikes kindly and surprisingly upon the modern ear, combining as it does the scientist's conception of the indestructibility of matter and the rule of return with Wordsworth's sense of the Divine Power that " keeps the stars from

wrong," and through whom "the most ancient heavens are fresh and strong."

But such a concept is by no means pleasing to your thoroughgoing theologian. Hence it is not surprising to learn from Ernest Barker (from whose Introduction to this edition I have quoted his translation of the above sentences of St. Augustine, a translation easier on the ear than the Elizabethan), that Harnack declared that "the history of the Church doctrines in the West is a much disguised struggle against Augustinianism." We are not perturbed at this. Today we are more interested in the Creator's Order than in Man's theology, and if we are Augustinians at all it is because of the very elements that estranged the Nominalists.

JOHN STEWART COLLIS

A MEDIEVAL CHINESE VERGIL*

This idyllic poem in 60 eight-line stanzas, equally divided under the headings of Spring, Late Spring, Summer, Autumn and Winter, gives a charming picture of life in a rural district near Soochow some eight centuries ago. Both in subject and treatment, it invites comparison with the Georgics of Vergil composed more than a thousand years earlier, due allowance being made for the difference of local products: for of course rice-growing and silkworm cultivation must here largely take the place of "tilth and vineyard, hive and horse and herd." And the heroic couplets into which the poem has been turned would recall Dryden's translation of the Georgics even more strongly if Mr. Bullett had been as punctilious as Dryden in his adherence to metre and rhyme. As it is, the length of his lines is apt to vary somewhat capriciously; he is often content with such distant approximations to rhyme as *jade* and *bud*, and in two of his stanzas there are actually no full rhymes at all. What is lost, however, in smoothness and musical rhythm has probably been gained in freedom and vivacity of expression. Certainly these verses display a poetic gift of no mean order.

Another point which has to be considered is the degree of fidelity with which the Chinese original is here represented. Mr. Bullett does not himself read Chinese, and we learn from his preface that the well-known scholar Mr. C. Tsui helped by supplying him with a literal equivalent of each word. Evidently the work has been conscientiously done, in so far as the Chinese text contains very little that does not appear in the translation. On the other hand, there is quite a lot in the English that is not to be found in the Chinese. Mr. Bullett tells us that he has rendered "each long Chinese line in two not so long English ones"; but in fact, whereas the Chinese line contains only seven words or syllables, there are, on an average, considerably more than seven words in each of Mr. Bullett's. The truth is that nothing like the terse simplicity of Chinese poetry can be successfully reproduced by any translator. In order to make

---

* *The Golden Year of Fan Cheng-ta.* A Chinese Rural Sequence rendered into English verse by GERALD BULLETT, with notes and calligraphic decorations by TSUI CHI. (University Press, Cambridge. 5*s*.)

a readable version, then, Mr. Bullett has been constrained to draw freely on his own imagination. Take as an example stanza 15, in which I have italicized what is not to be found, or even implied in the original:—

> Butterflies, *sauntering lazily here and there.*
> Enter the vegetable flowers pair by pair.
> *I bathe in the golden stream* of the long day,
> *Having in mind* no guest will come my way.
> *But hark!* a bark! And from over the bamboo fence
> *There's a sudden scatter of silly fugitive* hens!
> *I spend no time wondering who it can be:*
> A merchant come to buy my leaves of tea.

"Sauntering lazily," by the way, hardly suggests the rapid fluttering of a butterfly's wings. A really close translation of the stanza would run as follows:—

> Pairs of butterflies enter the rape flowers.
> During the long day no guest arrives at the homestead.
> A fowl flies over the bamboo fence, a dog barks at the door-hole,
> So I know that a trader has come to buy tea.

But unfortunately this is not poetry.

Besides furnishing the translation, Mr. Tsui has contributed a number of interesting notes in which various allusions are traced to their source, legends are recounted, and old customs are described. In Stanza 38, *ch'ido hsi* does not mean "the Night of Begging Good Luck," but the night on which girls pray for *skill* (in needlework). The second half of this stanza is also rather badly muddled in the translation. The "calligraphic decorations" with which Mr. Tsui is credited on the title-page consist of the title itself and the first line of each of the five sections of the poem, all written in elegant Chinese characters.

LIONEL GILES

MUSLIM STATESMANSHIP *

A partial edition of this work was first published in German in Bonn-Leipzig-Berlin in 1935; a complete English version appeared serially in *Islamic Culture* in 1941-42. The present is a revised edition.

The author, a member of the Faculty of Law of the Osmania University of Hyderabad (Deccan), aims to bring into relief the picture of another system of international law, which had served the requirements of another world culture, Islam's. Modesty constrains him to disclaim that his treatise would "meet all the requirements of the foreign and military departments of a modern Islamic state. "It is not a blue-print," he says, "it is a draft sketch."

"International law" is explained as "rules of the conduct of States in their mutual dealings." The objects and aims of Muslim international law, its sources (*e. g.*, the Quran, Sunna, the practice of rulers and the opinions of Muslim jurists, and treaties) are briefly examined. Reference is also made to international Muslim conferences, and to works of European authors (not merely English).

One of the author's theses is that the Quranic insistence on the brotherhood of man—"all being created from a single soul" (citing *Quran* IV. 1, XLIX. 13, VI. 99, VII. 189, XXXIX. 6, II. 213, etc.) makes Islam an internationalizing institution.

The history of international law

* *The Muslim Conduct of State.* By MUHAMMAD HAMID-ULLAH. (Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, Kashmiri Bazar, Lahore. Rs. 12/-)

before Islam, the ethical basis of Muslim law, the State's rights over land, the open sea, and enemy property, the modes of acquiring territory, treatment of non-Muslim subjects and hostile aliens by Muslim rulers, diplomacy, war, apostasy, rebellion, prisoners of war, slaves and neutrality are amongst the many topics dealt with.

The book is completely documented. Thus the principle that "party and judge cannot be in one and the same person" (or, as English lawyers put it, no man can be judge in his own matter) is supported by Sarakhsiy's *Mabsut* XVI. 73, that this principle applies even to the Khalif, with many precedents in which the first four Khalifs were individually concerned, followed by others referring to succeeding Khalifs. In the time of the Prophet women took part in battles as nurses, as transporters of the dead and wounded, as cooks, guards of stores, water-carriers, general servants and grave-diggers, and even as actual combatants. These statements are supported by no less than 28 citations under 17 separate heads.

A translation of the treaty between the Prophet and Suhail ibn 'Amr is particularly noteworthy.

Instructions to commanders by the Prophet and the Khalifs and bibliographies form the subjects of two appendices.

The work furnishes an erudite illustration of Islam as a complete code for the guidance of all human beings in all conditions of life: the ruler, no less than his poorest subject. When, however, in the complicated conditions of modern life, a rule of thumb has to be derived from religious and ethical teachings, they are liable to be interpreted so as to serve the particular need of the ruler whose conduct ought to be governed by those teachings and there is no sanction, unless faith supplies it.

FAIZ B. TYABJI

The Nyāyakusumāñjali of Udayanācārya: A Presentation of Theistic Doctrines according to the Nyaya System of Philosophy. Vol. I—Books 1 and 2. Translated into English by Swami RAVI TIRTHA. (Adyar Library Series No. 53. Rs. 4/-)

The *Nyāyakusumāñjali* of Udayanācārya (A. D. 984) in five books called *stabakas* (bunches,) is the first systematic attempt of the Nyāya School to prove the existence of God. It seeks to counteract the atheistic doctrine of the Buddhists; it also is a reply to the Mīmāṁsakas, who, though belonging to one of the six orthodox systems of philosophy, attached paramount importance to Sacrifices and allowed no room for God as the Creator or the regulator of the moral order in the world. Though this work of Udayana is one of the most outstanding, it is also one of the most difficult to understand, even with the aid of commentaries; and there is not available yet a critical edition with commentaries. Therefore one cannot but express deep admiration for the able manner in which the translator has executed his task. It is a faithful rendering of the original and quite readable. Pandit Gopinath Kaviraja had begun the translation of this work in 1923 (Sarasvati Bhavana Studies, Vol. 2, 159-191), but hs seems to have soon abandoned the attempt. The Introduction gives a succinct and able gist of the contents of the five books.

N. A. GORE

The Secret Dream: An Essay on Britain, America and Russia. By J. B. PRIESTLEY. (Turnstile Press, 10, Great Turnstile, London W. C. 1. 2*s*.)

The spirit of Mr. Priestley has often been compared to the spirit of Dickens, and rightly, because in such novels as *The Good Companions* and *Let the People Sing,* and lately again in his post-war story of demobilized soldiers, *Three Men in New Suits,* he has proved himself the interpreter of the plain man and woman of England, sympathizing with their joys, indignant over their wrongs. But he has followed in the steps of Dickens in this also, that he has allowed his love of humanity to carry him out of the fields of imaginative creation into the world of social and political criticism; the story-teller becomes the practical man.

In the gravest hour of the late War, for England, Mr. Priestley's voice on the radio became the very voice of the nation, and now in his new pamphlet, based itself upon broadcasts, he outlines his dream of the new world, urging the three great Powers to understand each other and to realize that their qualities are complementary, England standing for liberty, America for equality, Russia for fraternity. There is inevitably a touch of artificiality in fitting three great nations thus into the frame of an ancient slogan; but on the other hand the concepts "liberty, equality, fraternity" are so wide that they are almost bound to fit somewhere.

The equation of England with "liberty" is the most satisfying, and it is the most convincingly worked out, because Mr. Priestley understands the soul of England better than that of any other country. He agrees with the brilliant Latin-American philosopher, George Santayana, that "what governs the Englishman is his inner atmosphere, the weather in his soul," and he does not fear that a Socialist régime in this country will ever be allowed to take a shape that will deprive the Englishman of his right to be the steersman of his own life. But he is alarmed by signs of frustration, of "a thinning out of that inner atmosphere...and a growing confusion about the quality of life we are supposed to love," and begs his fellow-countrymen to

> heighten and colour the day's task by proclaiming great noble aims, and...not creep forwards towards some dreary bit of security, like so many spiritless would-be pensioners.

That is excellent; Mr. Priestley's summing up of the American spirit is rather less satisfying. Certainly he is right in emphasizing the American passion for equality and showing how it has arisen from the "frontier" spirit and the infinite possibilities of personal enterprise in that mighty continent. But are Americans any less devoted to "liberty" than the English? One may doubt it; indeed they are even more fiercely resentful of controls and dictations. The unbridled powers of rich men in America are the abuse of extreme liberty rather than a design to curtail freedom.

But perhaps the chief interest (at any rate in England) will attach to Mr. Priestley's analysis of Russia and her dream of "Fraternity." It is not surprising when he tells us that he is "an author who happens to be popular there." So is Dickens; and with a people who take to their hearts Priestley and Dickens the English must feel a profound affinity. When Mr. Priestley

tells us of "the atmosphere of simplicity, warmth, genuine interest and affection" which he met with among the Russian people nobody will feel the least sceptical. But he is not content with that. He does not wish anybody to make a distinction between the Russian nation and their Government. Such a distinction "overlooks the inconvenient fact that Bolshevism itself is very Russian, that the Russian Revolution was made in Russia by Russians." In Mr. Priestley's view, if "the whole rich warm stream of fraternal feeling" has "had to be covered over, thickly camouflaged, kept a secret," it is largely the fault of the Western world for its hostile attitude towards the Revolution. To discuss the justice of that would be to diverge from the *Aryan Path* into the thorny track of politics; let us simply note Mr. Priestley's conviction that if the West will show "friendliness and an affectionate interest," then Russia "will respond, indeed *must* respond." As an eminent Scottish philosopher has recently said, "Hope also is a virtue."

D. L. MURRAY

Sword of Gold: A Life of Mahatma Gandhi. BY ROY WALKER. (Indian Independence Union, 52, Lancaster Gate, London, W. 2. *7s. 6d.*)

The title of this book has been well chosen, as the author has not been concerned so much with merely giving us the life story of Gandhiji as with portraying him as the wielder of the weapon of non-violence. The chief interest therefore is in this weapon, how it came to be thought of, fashioned and used in the early stages in South Africa, and how its use was extended on a nation-wide scale in India and with what effect. The author is undoubtedly an admirer of Gandhiji and his method of non-violence; but he does not write as a sycophant or a fanatic. On the other hand, his style is objective and dispassionate. He writes simply and with ease, and in a manner to hold the interest of the reader throughout.

Gandhiji has seemed to many an enigma and a mystery. That is because they judge him purely on the political level, and do not see that he is essentially a man of religion, pledged to truth and non-violence. What appear to them as grave political blunders arise precisely from the fact that he is not out for political strategy at all. For him man's life with fellow-man is an arena wherein the weapon of non-violence must be tried, as it has never been so far. He is more concerned with this weapon than with gaining freedom for India. So even if it means political disaster, he puts an end to a Civil Disobedience Movement, much to the consternation of his political colleagues, if it has departed from non-violence. In giving us a life of Gandhiji from the angle of non-violence, the author has fixed on the clue which solves many a riddle associated with him. The book will therefore be found valuable for gaining a correct understanding of Gandhiji and his many "inconsistencies." It deals with events in his life till May 1944, when he was released.

BHARATAN KUMARAPPA

Life of Dayanand Saraswati. By HAR BILAS SARDA. (Vedic Pustaklaya, Kaiserganj, Ajmer. Rs. 12/or 21s.)

The only reliable source of information about Dayanand Saraswati's early life is the short autobiographical account published by Madame H. P. Blavatsky in the very first volume of her magazine, *The Theosophist,* and quoted here. Information about some later years is completely missing, but Shri Sarda has out-Boswelled Boswell in the inclusiveness of his sweep of the material available. Incident is piled bewilderingly upon incident, with considerable repetition and overlapping, and the account is not quite free from contradictions. But through them all strides Swami Dayanand, patriot and reformer, a Hercules in body and in intellect.

Dayanand was the pupil of the blind Sannyasin Virjanand Saraswati, whom Romain Rolland called "a learned man, a terrible man," so implacable was he in his condemnation of weakness and his hatred of superstition. He had vowed Dayanand to a lifetime of labour to re-establish the Vedic religion, and Dayanand kept his vow. He went up and down the land, calling on the people to realise the greatness of their country, to stand on their own feet and to work out their own salvation. Swami Dayanand had been at one time an Advaitist and the God defined in the basic principles of his Aryasamaj could easily be taken for the impersonal Absolute. Though he later preached a personal God, he was always strong in his condemnation of idol worship. He mercilessly discomfited opponents unable to produce Vedic authority for the practice. Fearlessly also he denounced the other evils, social and religious, which were emasculating modern India—child marriage, untouchability, the idea that caste was determined by birth instead of by conduct, immorality in high places, astrology, meaningless ceremonies, animal sacrifice and purdah, though he insisted that woman's place was in the home. On the positive side he preached return to the Vedic faith; physical well-being; education for all; economic and social reforms, including widow remarriage; cow protection; a common language, and even punctuality, declaring that one reason for the unhappy state of things in India was that people did not know the value of time. He would begin a lecture on time, even if not more than two had yet come. So outspoken and uncompromising a reformer naturally had countless enemies. He met attackers boldly, but succumbed in 1883 to poison, at the age of fifty-nine.

The book has a voluminous introduction besides four parts dealing respectively with the life, the works and the teachings of Swami Dayanand and with "Religions and Sects in India." The last is in part highly controversial. The book would have profited by its omission. Shri Sarda revives the charges against Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott which were answered fully over a year before Swami Dayanand's death, in the Supplement to *The Theosophist* for July 1882. Shri Sarda's attempted rebuttal is late and unconvincing.

There will be many to question some of the exalted claims made by Shri Sarda for his hero, none who will deny his power or his achievement in awakening his countrymen.

E. M. HOUGH

Rationalism in Education and Life. Papers Read at the First Annual Conference of the Rationalist Press Association. (C. A. WATTS and Co., LTD., LONDON. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

The Rationalist Press Association organized a Conference in the summer of 1945 at Wadham College, Oxford, and this book gives a full report of the extremely helpful and stimulating lectures then delivered. The presidential address, by Sir John Hammerton, is outspoken, and he is up to the minute in his references to our conceptions of God and the atom. He goes on to discuss the general ideas of God as held by different eminent prelates, and says,

> One thing is beyond dispute; the idea of God present in the mind of the Bishop of Birmingham...can have little resemblance to that in the minds of the Deans of Canterbury and Salisbury.

He adds that this is all to the good and indicates that church leaders are, at least, thinking men. Another most important point, particularly for all of us who are eager for toleration and true education, is that he pleads for a greater preparation of young minds, by the study of history, for the settling of their religious doubts.

The paper on "Ethics and the Child" by Kenneth Urwin is perhaps the most helpful for parents and teachers and suggests a course of study that would be helpful for adults as well as children, in learning about the great religions and moral systems of the world (this covering Eastern as well as Western systems).

Prof. Sargant Florence deals with Rationalism in University Education, while other eminent men discuss "The Birth of God in the Brain of the Social Animal," "The Place of Christianity in History," "Science and Cultural Values," "Philosophy and Religion" and so on.

What is, perhaps, of some importance to us all at the present time, is the fact pointed out by Mr. Urwin, that people are less open to influence by a morality enforced solely by religion. This is particularly true of England, which is in a state of transition. Many people who have withdrawn from the Christian Church have not found any stable moral code with which to replace the old, religious-moral grounding. In fact they have, as it were, thrown out the baby with the bath-water. The Rationalists agree that they must do their best to give the country a set of decent moral standards, but this is still difficult as so many avenues of approach, (including the radio) are closed to them.

It is impossible to do justice to a book so filled with matters of urgency, in a short review. I can only recommend it as truly worth while and very readable.

ELIZABETH CROSS

Our Relation to the Absolute : A Study in True Psychology. By SWAMI ABHEDANANDA. (Abhedananda Memorial Series No. 2, Ramakrishna Vedanta Math, 19 B, Raja Rajkrishna Street, Calcutta. Rs. 6/-)

This book, a collection of papers which have little connection with each other, is supposed to be a study in true psychology. But, beyond certain dogmatic statements which few Western psychologists would ever accept as true, there is nothing in it that can be said to throw any light upon a psychological problem. We might have expected from a publication of the Ramakrishna Vedanta Math a clear and illuminating presentation of the Vedantic standpoint on this all-important subject. Unfortunately there is nothing in the book that is either new, original or illuminating. Rather, we get the impression that the writer has no clear idea of Vedanta or even of his own stand-point. He appears to accept the Advaitic solution, but gives an interpretation of it which is both superficial and misleading. To the question whether it is necessary for the Absolute to manifest Itself constantly by means of material phenomena, he answers :—

> Yes, the Absolute constantly exists and manifests in some form or other. It is a part of its nature. There is no question of necessity or forcing its nature. If this manifestation stops...there would be manifestation in some other planet.

In another place he says :—

> The Absolute projects out of Its own body the first-born Lord or *Isvara*, projects this Cosmic Consciousness, or the Cosmic Ego, which becomes the Creator, the *prime-mover* of evolution. And matter again comes out of the same Absolute.

The writer, speaking to Western audiences, is afraid to speak of maya or the power of illusion. He is anxious to show that nothing is illusory to us, although it might be so in the end. He therefore traces all phenomena, material and mental, back to the Absolute, and dispenses altogether with the vital notion of Maya in Advait Vedanta. It is a misrepresentation greatly to be deplored.

On the central question of our relation to the Absolute, Swami Abhedananda's solution is half-hearted and halting. It is intelligible that we, as individuals, remain individuals to the end,—the view accepted by the dualists. It is also intelligible that there is only one real entity called Brahman or the Absolute, and that we, as individuals, are merely adjectives of this one all-encompassing reality, which is the position of qualified monism. Lastly, it is intelligible that the Absolute is unqualified pure being, intelligent and blissful, and that we, as individuals, do not really exist in the Absolute, but only appear illusorily to do so. This is the position of non-dualistic Vedanta. The writer of the book, however, does not seem to accept whole-heartedly any of these well-known interpretations of Vedantic thought. After giving us the specious instance of the relation of bubbles and waves to the ocean, he says, " Our existence is a part of the Infinite Existence. Our life-force is a part of the Infinite Life-force. " If we are a part of the Absolute, we cannot be wholly unreal or illusory; neither can the Absolute be really partless. Does the Swami then accept qualified non-dualism ? But, no. He says, the individual is one with the Absolute. After exulting in oneness in the true Advaitic spirit, he says :—

> Oneness is the relation of the true seeker after the Absolute with the Absolute..When we have become *one* with the Absolute there

is no *other* relation that can be higher than that.

Oneness cannot be a relation between two distinct entities. It can only be a relation when one of the terms, taken to be distinct, is found to be in reality non-distinct from and in illusory identity with the other term. In short, we cannot be a part of the Absolute. Either we are the Absolute in our true nature, and our individuality and separateness are only illusory; or, alternatively, we are individuals related to other individuals, with nothing that can be called the Absolute. Swami Abhedananda goes so far astray from his real position as to make this statement, common to Western idealists, but foreign to the best interpretation of Vedantic thought :—

> A little animalcule that is living under your feet, has its place....Each one has its place and purpose, only we do not realize that purpose because we see only the surface.

We do not think that the writer has done justice to the subject and the whole presentation suffers from irrelevance and looseness of expression.

G. R. MALKANI

Poems: Past and Present. By SRI AUROBINDO. (Sri Aurobindo Ashram, Pondicherry). This slender sheaf of poems of the cloister is carved like "the new life's doors...in silver light." They bid us rise from the

> ...confusion
> Of desires that strive and cry,
> Some forbidden, some achieving
> Anguish after ecstasy

to scale

> ...the last tremendous brow
> And the great rock that none has trod:
> A step, and all is sky and God.

Sri Aurobindo contrasts memorably "the little troubled life-god within," with "his tiger-stripes of virtue and sin," and the "still soul" which these veil, the "blind, indwelling deity." The poet is serene in his assurance that

> Even in rags I am a god;
> Fallen, I am divine;
> High I triumph when down-trod,
> Long I live when slain.

Of the three earlier poems only one, "Hell and Heaven," touches the height—and the depth—of some of the later five, with their mystic cry

> Out, out with the mind and its candle flares,
> Light, light the suns that never die.

E. M. H.

Sudden Retrospect and Other Poems. By GOPAL N. NILAVER. (Author, c/o Hosali Press, 1-A, South Parade, Bangalore. Rs. 3/-).

Here is authentic poetry, some of it richly satisfying, nearly all of it above the Indo-Anglian average. Shri Nilaver is sensitive to Nature's moods, always high-minded. What his poetry misses in intensity of feeling it gains in dignity and calm. He is graceful in concept and expression and almost completely at his ease in the English medium, though free-verse suits his Muse better than the conventional poetic forms. The little book is beautifully printed.

E. M. H.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____ *ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."
HUDIBRAS

Having come to power, the leaders of the Indian National Congress are busy introducing reform legislation while carrying on the administration of the country from day to day.* In the different provinces, like Bombay and Madras, good reforms in the Excise, Judicial, Educational, and other departments are being planned. At the Centre, under the able guidance of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, great work is being done. The whole-hearted support given to him and his colleagues by the present Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief is in line with the best British traditions. While the reconciliation, leading to abiding friendship, in the recently broken ties between Hindu and Muslim brothers is on the way, the Congress leaders are experiencing in this country expressions of world forces where lawlessness and license are showing their ugly heads under the name of liberty.

Gandhiji, the guide, philosopher and friend of the Indian National Congress, has had to strike warning notes which have a wider application than to the specific cases about which he writes. In his *Harijan* for 6th October, writing about "The Rights of Harijans," he says:—

> Man is master as far as performance of his duty is concerned and I hold that his rights really spring from duties properly performed. Such rights alone are befitting as also lasting. If every non-Harijan who had ability was able to exercise his rights, society would be disrupted. Performance of duty is open to every one. The field of service is immense. Few can become masters and he fails who seeks to become master. I know, however, that people do not act as I have suggested. Hence there is a general scramble for power. And many are turned away disappointed. Holding the views I do, I have tried to act on them for the last fifty years. I am uninterested in the unbecoming struggle for power. My sole advice to Harijans is that they should think only in terms of their duties and rights will follow as surely as day follows night.

Again, answering a question about wrangling and corruption, Gandhiji states:—

> There can be no room for wrangles, when service is the ideal. Congressmen should realize that only a few can become leaders, the goal for all Congressmen to set before themselves can only be to qualify as true servants of the nation. An institution that suffers from a plethora of leaders is surely in a bad way. For instance, if every Khudai Khidmatgar aspired to become the chief, it would make the life of Badshah Khan hell besides disrupting the Khudai Khidmatgar organization itself.

Many Indians who call themselves followers of Gandhiji break the principles of his philosophy and bring him discredit. He is being charged with the responsibility for lawlessness because of the blunders committed, say, in Bihar. He writes:—

* These notes were written on the 9th of October. Since then further developments have taken place on which we add a paragraph at the close.—ED.

I have even heard the argument that I am largely responsible for the prevailing lawlessness, not only in Bihar, but throughout India.

Of course, the charge is untrue but his words have a meaning and a message not only for Bihar but for license-mongers everywhere. He adds :—

I have purposely entered upon what appears to be a personal note, not at all in self-defence, but in order to drive the point home that what is said to be going on in Bihar is administration of rank poison. That way lies not self-rule but licentiousness, not independence but helpless dependence, not life but suicide.

A false philosophy of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, and of man's spiritual dignity and material possessions has intoxicated many young and immature minds everywhere, including our country of India, where people ought to know better. But Indians must make themselves familiar with the real teachings of Reincarnation and Karma in a thoroughgoing manner. Writes Gandhiji :—

I do not believe in dead uniformity. "All men are born equal and free" is not Nature's law in the literal sense. All men are not born equal in intellect, for instance, but the doctrine of equality will be vindicated if those who have superior intellect will use it not for self-advancement at the expense of others, but for the service of those who are less favoured in that respect than they.

One stupendous world reform is likely to come out of India, inspired by the ethical ideas of Gandhiji which are as ancient as they are true. That reform is in connection with the weakness of democracy where the majority vote is supposed to rule and election results are taken to be an infallible index of the people's views. The voice of the people is not the voice of God in modern democracies. The voice of God is often a cry in the wilderness of the politician's democracy. Gandhiji had to give up his membership in the Indian National Congress because, though his voice is always heard, it is not uniformly heeded. The country's government needs stimulation but not from an opposition. What is needed, not only in India but everywhere, is a moral energisation from the united efforts of a few noble-hearted minds contributing each its quota round a table where none are for the party, not even for the national state, but all primarily for the good of humanity. The masses need to be educated into discipline so that mobocracy cannot rear its ugly head. The masses can be led by the few real leaders of the people, assisted by the disciplined class of the educated—the link between the seeing leaders and the led. The cultured intellects alone can lead the masses with the aid of the middle class. In the moral and social order, as in the economic, the middle class will prove itself the backbone of the body politic.

In our editorial for August 1940, under the caption "The Enduring France," we commented upon the surrender of the French Army to the advancing Germans. We voiced our sympathy as our hope in the endeavour, courage and sacrifice, more powerful than bombs and tanks, evinced by the French nation. We wrote : "They will rise superior to the mortal death which guns have temporarily brought about." We added :—

Through the valley of humiliation the great people, the creators and upholders *par excellence* of Occidental culture, have now to pass. Though geographically France has been sacrificed, culturally no soldier has con-

quered or can conquer her, no dictator has murdered or can murder her. Their eleventh-century poet, Guillaume de Poitiers, has a message with inspiration for today:—

There are who hold my folly great
Because with little hope I wait:
But one old saw doth animate
And me assure:
Their hearts are high, their might is great
Who will endure.

In this era the light of culture burns dim everywhere: it is almost smoked out by the forces of barbarism which are at play. France is enveloped in them. In Paris, the Capital of Culture, however, there are signs manifesting which encourage the lovers of wisdom, virtue and beauty. On the literary renaissance there is no room to expatiate; something very tangible and promising has emerged and is already making history. We can only chronicle some acts of social uplift, which the French Government, even under the disadvantage of the strife of party-politics, has been able to perform. For example, Reuter reported on the 8th October from Paris that the law closing the brothels passed last April by the French Constituent Assembly became effective at midnight on Sunday the 6th October. This law makes organised prostitution illegal. Last April

the French Constituent Assembly approved unanimously a bill suppressing prostitution in metropolitan France and increasing efforts to wipe out white slavery.

The new law—proposed by the Cabinet and drawn up by the Assembly's Commission for Family, Population and Public Health—called for closing all houses of prostitution within from one to six months, according to the size of the cities. Towns of fewer than 5,000 inhabitants had to close their institutions within one month.

The old French system of licensing prostitutes is abolished and stiff penalties are set up.

All registers of prostitutes were ordered destroyed immediately and special establishments for the voluntary "re-education and social re-classment" of the women were ordered set up.

Thus at last this open sore has been closed by the action of the long outraged conscience of the French people through the instrumentality of the new legislature. This particular blot on civilised communities has thus received an open condemnation in one of its most prominent strongholds, which cannot but have salutary effects. No longer will it be possible for the individual to screen himself behind the pretext that, after all, the practice has the sanction of the laws of the country.

Is there a lover of womanhood and a true high standard of living who will not rejoice at this? The abolition of a corrupting institution which made the name of France, and especially of Paris, so notorious is a great step in the right direction and augurs well for the new social order which all lovers of humanity are looking for.

Next, who has not heard of the evils of the prison colony on Devil's Island? Also last April, *The New York Times* reported this:—

Devil's Island, nemesis of France's hardened criminals for a century, will succumb in the next three years to a mild-mannered Salvation Army major with orders from the French Government to liquidate the prison colony that became a synonym for penological hell.

The major, Charles A. Pean, who flew here on Tuesday from Paris on his way to French Guiana, disclosed his plans for the liquidation in an interview yesterday....

The penal colony was founded in 1852, when the first convoy of prisoners arrived, though it was not until 1854 that Napoleon III struck off an edict legalizing their shipment there....

The settlement grew crowded with additional arrivals, there was no market in which

to sell limited crops, men stopped working and plied their old criminal pursuits. The authorities then installed compounds, dungeons and an infamous régime of cruelty. Major Pean will fly to Guiana in the next few days to bring salvation to the last survivors of that régime.

Thus France is once again beginning to lead the way in Europe to a life based on high ideals rooted in Culture. Her mellowing influence will go a great way in harmonising the discords of the rest of Europe.

The era of internationalism is opening. Our firmament has some signs of good omen. When nationalists and politicians are manœuvring and quarrelling for selfish gains men of insight are busy constructing avenues which alone can be used for advancing the cause of global peace. The cry of one world or none may not mean very much to the debating diplomats, but it has awakened some to seek ways and means to correct international action. Thus the project to focus attention on the truth that different racial and nationalistic cultures are of value to all humanity.

We welcome the project of a series of international journals initiated by Dr. Stan Dotremont, of the Royal Academy of Belgium, of the Academy of French Literature and Language and of the International Academy of the Hague. These journals will deal with literature, theatre, music, etc. from an international view-point and bring together contributions from the front rank thinkers of different countries.

We translate the following from a circular received :—

To-day great human problems rest on an international or universal plan.

Yet, there is, properly speaking, no international press endeavouring to extract and to serve the highest "common good" of the entire human family; the men of different nations of the world, united by powerful and new solidarities do not know or understand each other well; they can hardly grasp the meaning of events and the new duties, individual, family and national, imposed by a fresh expansion of historical formations.

A great tragedy has taken place in East Bengal for which the I. N. C. Working Committee is rightly holding the Muslim League and its Bengal Government responsible. It also is of opinion that the British Governor of Bengal and the Governor General of India have failed in their respective duties to the people of the country. Feelings have been running high and the constructive work of the Interim Government is seriously threatened. Peace between the two communities, as well as between the ministers and the Viceroy, must be maintained if real progress is to be achieved. The work which has unified India should not be wasted. One indivisible India alone will guarantee the Country's real progress as well as the peace of Asia and the world.

25-10-46.